From: Fleisig, Erica

Location: DCRoomWest6105ERockCreek/DC-EPA-West-OST

Importance: Normal

Subject: Discuss NWEA petition for WA ALC and possible response

Start Date/Time: Tue 3/15/2016 8:00:00 PM **End Date/Time:** Tue 3/15/2016 9:00:00 PM Petition to Update Washington WQS FINAL (3).pdf

Petition follow up letter Aug 31 2015.pdf

Second follow up letter.pdf

Assuming we get an extension on our response from 3/3 to the first week in April, we wanted to have a discussion about our response. Scheduling this for when Matt is back in the office, which will still give us ~ 3 weeks to develop a response.

Call-in: Ex. 6 - Personal Privacy

Adding Matt and David's exchange below, and attaching the petition docs:

Hi David,

Thanks for taking the time to summarize the series of petitions for everyone. Ultimately, I think we'll need management to decide on the approach we would want to take on a potential response (adding Angela) and I'm happy to set up a conversation if we want to talk about the pros and cons you've described. As Erica stated, we spent some time writing up a draft response to the petition (attached) which is now a bit outdated with the latest follow up letter from NWEA. However, you'll see the response was very general and definitely didn't get into detail on the information provided in the petitions.

I've answered some of your questions in red below.

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

- In their August 31, 2015 follow-up letter, they have three main arguments:
 - o The Oregon and Idaho BiOps called jeopardy on arsenic, copper, selenium, cyanide, and mercury and show that Washington needs to revise their criteria for these pollutants:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

The Orca Recovery Plans show that Washington needs tougher WQS:

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client

• The Services' criticism of the Industrial Stormwater General Permit shows that Washington needs tougher WQS, for copper in particular.

Ex. 5 - Attorney Client